DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 147 UD 024 489

TITLE	Project ESL-SEDAC, 1983-84. E.S.E.A. Title VII Annual Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE	[85]
NOTE	26p.; For related document, see ED 245 042.
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Educational Assessment, New York City Board of Education, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Bilingual Education Programs; Daily Living Skills; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *Limited English Speaking; Parent Participation; *Program Effectiveness; *Special Education; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; *New York City Board of Education; *Project ESL SEDAC NY

ABSTRACT

During 1983-84, the second of three program cycles of the Title VII English as a Second Language, Special Education Development Approach Curriculum Project (ESL-SEDAC) was fully implemented in the New York City Public Schools. The project provided direct instruction to 260 handicapped limited English proficient students, resource assistance, ongoing individual staff training, staff development, and parent training workshops. All program objectives were fully or partially attained. The proposed criteria for student achievement were met in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as was the criterion for improvement of the instructional skills of participating classroom teachers. Staff development and parent training workshops were effective and well received, although not as well attended as hoped for. The program curriculum, "Day by Day in English: ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide," was field tested, revised, and distributed. The following recommendations are offered for continued program effectiveness: (1) continue to provide services to students, parents, and classroom teachers; (2) explore additional ways of documenting pupil achievement; and (3) seek to utilize program, school, and community resources to increase parental participation.
(Author/KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262147

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. K. Minter
NYC Bd. of Ed.
Brooklyn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PROJECT ESL-SEDAC

1983-84

OEA Evaluation Report

CD024489

Robert Tobias, Administrator
Judith Torres, Senior Manager

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

E.S.E.A. TITLE VII

PROJECT ESL-SEDAC

1983-84

Division of Special Education
Edward Sermier, Chief Administrator

D.S.E. Reimbursable Programs
Allison Tupper

Frances Segan, Project Coordinator

Prepared by:

O.E.A./Special Education Evaluation Unit

Ronald C. Miller, Evaluation Manager
Tomi Berney, Evaluation Specialist
Marcia Torres, Evaluation Specialist
Deborah Allen, Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

EVALUATION SUMMARY

During 1983-84, the second of three program cycles of the Title VII English as a Second Language, Special Education Development Approach Curriculum Project (ESL-SEDAC) was fully implemented. The project provided direct instruction to 260 handicapped limited English proficient (LEP) students, resource assistance, ongoing individual staff training, staff development, and parent training workshops.

All program objectives were fully or partially attained. The proposed criteria for student achievement were met in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as was the criterion for improvement of the instructional skills of participating classroom teachers. Staff development and parent training workshops were effective and well received, although not as well attended as hoped for. The program curriculum, Day by Day in English: ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide, was field tested, revised, and distributed.

The following recommendations are offered for continued program effectiveness:

- continue to provide services to students, parents, and classroom teachers;
- explore additional ways of documenting pupil achievement;
- seek to utilize program, school, and community resources to increase parental participation.

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the evaluation of the 1983-84 Title VII English as a Second Language, Special Education Developmental Approach Curriculum Project (ESL-SEDAC) of the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) of the New York City Public Schools. This is the second year of the program, which has a projected three year cycle. The program provides supplementary instruction, resource services, staff development, and parent education to support the basic special education program for handicapped students with limited English proficiency (LEP) throughout the New York City public schools. A central program goal was the preparation of a developmental, language-based E.S.L. curriculum which focuses on daily living skills to promote growth in English proficiency.

Results of a 1981 D.S.E. survey showed that there were more than 10,000 handicapped Spanish-dominant LEP students who were in need of E.S.L. and subject-matter instruction. In addition, D.S.E. served at least 500 Indo-Chinese- and French-Creole-language-dominant students with similar needs. The ESL-SEDAC program was designed to help meet the educational needs of these students as mandated in the Lau Regulations and the Aspira Decision.

Findings from the evaluation of the first program cycle, 1982-83, showed that ESL-SEDAC served 255 handicapped LEP students. The proposed criteria for student achievement were met in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Responses on participant questionnaires indicated that the staff development workshops were

effective and well received. The program also made progress toward full attainment of its parent involvement objective during the 1983-84 cycle. Finally, the program compiled and field-tested a comprehensive curriculum, Day by Day in English: An ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide.

The 1983-84 program cycle was evaluated by the Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) through the collection and analysis of pupil achievement data and staff development questionnaires, and the results of interviews with project staff and observations of classes served by the program. All data were recorded on O.E.A.-developed forms. The 1983-84 evaluation addressed the following issues:

- To what extent was the program implemented as proposed?
- Did the program meet its objectives in the areas of student achievement, staff training, curriculum development, and parent training?

The following chapters present the findings of the evaluation. Chapter II provides a description of the program and the assessment of program implementation; Chapter III addresses the level of attainment of program objectives; and Chapter IV presents conclusions and recommendations.

II. EVALUATION OF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND METHODOLOGY

ESL-SEDAC supplemented the basic special education program for handicapped LEP students by providing direct pupil instruction, resource services, staff development, and parent education. The target population were LEP students who were two or more years below grade level in reading or math, had never been served by other Title VII programs, and had scored below the twentieth percentile on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB). Program participants, who spoke Spanish, Haitian Creole, or Indo-Chinese languages, included learning disabled, emotionally handicapped, educable mentally retarded, and neurologically impaired and emotionally handicapped students. The basic special education program was provided in self-contained classes staffed by tax-levy teachers in the ratio of 12 students to one teacher or in resource rooms where the student-staff ratio was five to one.

Pupil-centered objectives of the program called for student gains in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Other program objectives were to promote parent involvement, improve instructional skills of participating classroom teachers, and, the central program goal, to develop an E.S.L. curriculum based in daily living activities.

An O.E.A. consultant visited 10 of the 19 program sites to observe instruction, review student records, and interview building principals

and classroom teachers of participating students, as well as program staff. In addition, the consultant observed three of the five staff-development workshops offered by ESL-SEDAC project staff for both participating and non-participating special education classroom teachers. The following sections present the findings from the interviews and observations.

FINDINGS

Level of Implementation

During 1983-84, ESL-SEDAC served 260 students at 19 schools located in the Bronx, Manhattan, and Brooklyn; an additional 178 monolingual students participated in demonstration lessons provided by the project. A total of 60 teachers of participating students received ongoing individual training in the use of the program curriculum and materials and E.S.L. teaching strategies. Program staff also conducted sessions periodically for small groups of teachers and administrative and supervisory staff at participating public schools and also at the Lexington School for the Deaf. Finally, the program developed and presented five staff development and four parent education workshops.

Staff included the program coordinator, who coordinated and supervised the overall organization and implementation of the program, including fiscal management, conducted staff development and parent education workshops, and served as resource teacher in one region; two resource teachers who visited tax-levy classroom teachers to provide resource materials and demonstration lessons, and to assist in E.S.L. instructional strategies, materials development, and promoting parent

involvement; and three paraprofessionals who assisted in materials distribution and individual and small-group E.S.L. instruction. They also assisted in parent contact and in conducting workshops for parents.

Curriculum Development

The major resource activity in 1983-84 was the implementation of Day by Day in English: An ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide which was developed and field-tested during the first program cycle. Day by Day in English is organized around specific daily living themes which form the basis for comprehensive instructional units containing vocabulary, sample lesson plans, and a range of activities for students at different levels of English-language proficiency. The curriculum contains a total of eight resource units: the home; the school; community, communication, and travel; clothing and seasons; shopping and food; health, hygiene, and safety; recreation; and jobs and careers. Each of the program participants received a copy of the curriculum guide at the beginning of the 1983-84 school year.

Direct Pupil Instruction and Ongoing Staff Training

A primary component of the ESL-SEDAC project was direct pupil instruction with the goal of improving students' abilities in English-language reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The weekly sessions were conducted by the resource teachers in English, with reinforcement activities in the child's dominant language. Spanish-speaking students, who made up the large majority of program participants, received instruction as a whole class; they attended bilingual special education classes for

their basic educational program. The Haitian-Creole- and Indo-Chinese-speaking students received whole-class instruction, often followed by one-to-one tutorial or small-group work; for the most part they were in monolingual special education classes. Project staff reported that they based their instructional planning on the students' individual educational plans (I.E.P.s), which were maintained by the special education classroom teachers, and that they assessed student progress informally based on student responses.

O.E.A. observed 14 instructional episodes, conducted by the project coordinator, resource teachers, and classroom teachers. All were based directly on the Day by Day curriculum and consisted of three major elements: an introductory discussion; the presentation or development of a concept; and finally, a task for students to complete. Lessons typically centered on familiar, real-life experiences such as shopping in a supermarket, choosing appropriate clothing for different seasons, responding to emergency situations, and reading movie ads. The relationship between project staff and classroom teachers appeared to be excellent. During the lessons conducted by project staff, classroom teachers participated actively, providing individual help or alerting project staff to students' special needs or abilities. During the lessons conducted by classroom teachers, which were being observed by the project coordinator, the classroom teachers showed clearly that they had incorporated instructional techniques and strategies from the ESL-SEDAC curriculum and training. (See Chapter III for futher information on ongoing staff training.)

According to interviews, classroom teachers found the full-class demonstration lessons highly valuable. Three of the four monolingual teachers stated that all their students, LEP and English proficient benefited from the ESL-SEDAC lessons. A number of principals expressed an interest in using ESL-SEDAC approaches for LEP students in regular education classes.

Other Resource Services

In addition to demonstration lessons and ongoing consultations with classroom teachers, program resource services also involved the provision of instructional materials including various texts, posters, games, and consumable supplies. Resource materials were distributed through the classroom teachers of students served as a whole class, and given directly to students receiving pull-out instruction. Among the materials that were viewed as most effective by project staff and classroom teacher were Day by Day in English, Jazz Chants, American Recreation, and the Bell and Howell Language Masters. Eight of the ten classroom teachers interviewed reported that they used Day by Day in English at least once a week, and most felt that the innovative materials were the most valuable feature of staff development. Some teachers of intermediate and junior high school students suggested that materials would be improved by the addition of higher-level content.

Staff Development Workshops

The program provided five staff development workshops, four of which were presented at three regional offices; the workshops were planned by

the project coordinator and implemented by project staff and outside educational consultants. Sessions were open to all special education classroom teachers.

The first workshop, which was attended by 31 staff, provided an overview of the project and an introduction to the program curriculum.

In the second workshop, 21 participants received further instruction in use of Day by Day and other project materials, and in writing behavioral objectives in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The third workshop was conducted by educational consultants, who presented analyses of the three cultures--Hispanic, Haitian-Creole, and Indo-Chinese--served by the project; 27 staff attended. Each analysis consisted of a profile of cultural and familial patterns, communication and learning styles, and suggestions for appropriate teacher-pupil interactions. The fourth workshop offered E.S.L. techniques and instructional grouping strategies, based on current research on E.S.L. strategies and language development theory; 30 staff participated. The final workshop was held at Bank Street College of Education, where program staff presented specific E.S.L. instructional strategies, ideas for teacher-made materials, and tips for using commercially-prepared materials. This was a participatory, hands-on workshop attended by ten participants. A question-and-answer period followed each session and participants completed questionnaires assessing the workshop's impact. (See Chapter III.)

O.E.A. observed four of the five workshops offered and found them

to be well-organized and informative. Although attendance was substantially lower than it had been the previous year when a stipend was provided, participants were responsive and enthusiastic. According to the project coordinator, participation was greatest in those regions in which the staff development workshops were linked to the mandated course for newly-appointed teachers. Holding sessions in several schools in a region as opposed to one session at the regional office also appeared to encourage greater attendance.

Parent Education and Involvement

The program's parent component was fully implemented. Four parent workshops were developed which were presented by program staff in conjunction with outside consultants and community resource persons. A total of 10 sessions were held; all four workshops were presented to parents of Spanish- and Haitian Creole-speaking students and two were presented to parents of Chinese-speaking students.

The first workshop, which was attended by 37 parents and staff, introduced the objectives of the ESL-SEDAC project (to provide limited English-speaking pupils with instruction focused on daily living skills). The second workshop attended by 16 participants, provided parents with ideas for working with and developing E.S.L. materials at home. The third workshop, attended by 25, presented parents with ways to help their children with homework and a list of vocabulary words associated with school assignments. This workshop was jointly conducted by the project and D.S.E.'s Parent-Community Liaison Program.

The last workshop, which had 86 participants, identified community agencies serving each group. The project coordinator reported that some principals of participating schools provided more active support than others, and this was reflected in workshop attendance.

Based on their responses on O.E.A.-developed workshop evaluation questionnaires, participants reacted highly positively to the presentations. Over 85 percent gave the highest or next-to-highest ratings on a five-point scale on all of the following: post-session knowledge of workshop content; clarity of the information presented; overall usefulness of the workshop; adequacy of opportunities to ask questions and express ideas; and the desire to attend future workshops. Of the remaining participants, nearly all gave high ratings on everything except post-session knowledge. Many parents added comments to the questionnaires expressing enthusiasm for the program. (For further information, see Chapter III.)

Five of the ten classroom teachers interviewed felt that the program had had a positive effect on parent involvement in other school-related activities, such as I.E.P. conferences or informal visits to discuss their children's progress.

III. EVALUATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The program was designed to attain seven objectives. Four of these concerned pupil achievement, one concerned parent participation, one involved mastery of teaching skills in response to staff development, and the last involved the development of a program curriculum. The following sections present the objectives, the methods of evaluation, and the findings, preceded by a description of the student population.

DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION

Program staff reported demographic and achievement data for 255 students on O.E.A.-designed data retrieval forms. Participating students ranged in age from six to 16 years; mean age was about 11 years (S.D. = 2.2). About 80 percent of the students attended elementary schools; the others were in intermediate and junior high schools. Two-thirds were in classes for learning disabled students, and the rest were divided among the following programs: resource room; educable mentally retarded; emotionally handicapped; and neurologically impaired and emotionally handicapped. The primary language of most students (81 percent) was Spanish, 11 percent spoke an Indo-Chinese language, and eight percent spoke Haitian Creole.

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES

Four pupil achievement objectives were proposed which called for student mastery in the areas of English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Each objective called for mastery by June, 1984

of at least one new skill by 80 percent of the participants; the specific skills for each student were drawn from the individual educational plan (I.E.P.).

To determine whether the objective was achieved, frequency distributions of student mastery in each of the four areas were prepared. These data, which are presented in Table 1, indicated that, as in the previous cycle, the criterion of 80 percent was exceeded for all four areas. Over 95 percent of the students mastered at least one new skill in English-language listening skills, nearly 94 percent mastered speaking skills, over 91 percent mastered reading skills, and nearly 89 percent mastered writing skills. Accordingly, the four pupil achievement objectives were attained.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The parent involvement objective called for participation by 50 percent of the parents of program students in at least two activities, including workshops, individual conferences, I.E.P. conferences, and open school night, by June, 1984. Records were available for parent participation in workshops. These data showed that parents of 84 students, or 32.9 percent of the program participants, attended at least one parent workshop and parents of 13, or 5.1 percent, attended two or more of the four workshops offered. Because records of other types of parent participation were not obtained, it was not possible to evaluate the objective as originally proposed. However, given that the three other parent activities encouraged by the project, i.e., individual

Table 1

Frequency Distributions of Student Mastery in Four Areas of E.S.L. Instruction

Number of Skills Mastered	Number of Students	Percent of Population	Cumulative Percent
	Listening Skills		
4 or more	117	45.9	45.9
3	36	14.1	60.0
2	65	25.5	85.5
1	25	9.8	95.3
0	12	4.7	100.0
	255		
	Speaking Skills		
4 or more	132	51.7	51.7
3	26	10.2	61.9
2	54	21.2	83.1
1	27	10.6	93.7
0	16	6.3	100.0
	255		
	Reading Skills		
4 or more	108	42.3	42.3
3	46	18.0	60.3
2	49	19.2	79.5
1	30	11.8	91.3
0	22	8.6	99.9[a]
	255		
	Writing Skills		
4 or more	109	42.7	42.7
3	46	18.0	60.7
2	40	15.7	76.4
1	31	12.2	88.6
0	29	11.4	100.0
	255		

[a]Does not total 100 percent because of rounding.

- The criterion of mastery of at least one skill by 80 percent of the participants was exceeded in all four subject areas. Accordingly, the objective was attained.

conferences, I.E.P. conferences, and open school night, all take place in the local school rather than a centralized location, it may be expected that these activities are relatively easier to attend. Accordingly, it is likely that parent involvement was substantial and the objective was largely, if not completely, met.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The staff development objective stated that by June, 1984, 80 percent of the participating teachers would demonstrate mastery of five teaching skills developed in staff training sessions. Mastery was assessed through procedures developed jointly by program staff and O.E.A.; these included self-reports of knowledge gained at staff development workshops, as well as the project staff's assessment of participating teachers' use of the program curriculum, materials, and teaching strategies in the classroom.

Ongoing Staff Training

In all, 60 teachers received individual ongoing training from program staff in E.S.L. instructional techniques, methods and materials, and curriculum development. Priority was given to new teachers. Total number of hours of training received ranged from 0.5 to 22 hours depending on when the teacher joined the project; most sessions were reported as one-half hour each. Twelve teachers received more than ten hours of training; 22 received between 6.5 and 10 hours; 20 teachers had from 2.5 to six hours; and six teachers had fewer than 2.5 hours of training.

Table 2

Amount of Individual Staff Training Received
and Number of Objectives Mastered by Classroom Teachers

Hours of Training	Number of Objectives Mastered	Number of Teachers	Percent	Cumulative Percent
more than 20	more than 40	2	3.3	3.3
18.5 - 20	37 - 40	2	3.3	6.6
16.5 - 18	33 - 37	1	1.7	8.3
14.5 - 16	29 - 32	3	5.0	13.3
12.5 - 14	25 - 28	0	0	13.3
10.5 - 12	21 - 24	4	6.7	20.0
8.5 - 10	17 - 20	5	8.3	28.3
6.5 - 8	13 - 16	17	28.3	56.6
4.5 - 6	9 - 12	12	20.0	76.6
2.5 - 4	5 - 8	8	13.3	89.9
0.5 - 2	1 - 4	6	10.0	99.9[a]
		60		

[a]Does not total 100 percent because of rounding.

- Nearly 90 percent of the teachers receiving individual staff training mastered at least five training objectives as indicated by program records.

Priority was given to new teachers. In addition, trainers conducted over 70 hours of training small groups of teachers and administrators. For each session the trainer noted whether or not the training objectives had been accomplished and how this was assessed, whether through discussion, observation, or written work. In all cases, the trainers indicated that training objectives were accomplished, and in the large majority of cases the assessment was based on discussion between trainer and teacher.

In order to determine whether the staff development objective was met, the number of instructional objectives mastered by each teacher was estimated from program records. Given that most sessions were one-half hour long, it was assumed that at least one objective was taught in each half-hour session: Since records indicated that all sessions were successful, total number of objectives mastered was estimated at twice the number of hours of individual training received. On this basis, twelve teachers were judged to have mastered more than 20 objectives; 22 mastered from 13 to 20 objectives; 20 mastered between five and 12 objectives; and six teachers mastered fewer than five objectives. (See Table 2.) In all, 54 out of 60 teachers, 90 percent, mastered at least five instructional objectives. Accordingly, the criterion level of 80 percent was surpassed and the objective was met.

It must be noted that the number of teachers receiving individual training in 1983-84 was lower than in the prior year. Limited staff resources may have contributed to the reduced number of teachers who were given demonstration lessons. Because of staffing limitations, priority was given to new teachers and those who expressed the greatest need.

Staff Development Workshops

Five staff development workshops were held. At four of these, participants completed questionnaires indicating their pre- and post-session knowledge of the topic presented. The level of knowledge ranged from "none" to "full" and was indicated on a seven-point continuum. (At one workshop participants wrote open-ended comments and reactions.) In addition, at three of the workshops participants noted, on a one-to-seven scale, their evaluation of the workshops' organization, the clarity of objectives, the benefit derived, and the overall quality of the workshop; at another, participants rated other indicators of workshop effectiveness. Response rates ranged from 78 to 100 percent.

In order to determine the extent of mastery of workshop skills, the participants' post-session responses were examined; mastery was defined by a reported level of knowledge falling at least midway between "none" and "full", or on the seven-point scale, a score of four or above. Each of the five workshops presented information on one to four topics, for a total of 14 topics; data were available for 11 topics. Results indicated that nine of the 11 workshop topics were mastered by at least 80 percent of the workshop participants. (See Table 3.) However, because workshop participants were not identified, it was not possible to assess a specific teacher's mastery across all workshops.

Average pre-session responses on each topic ranged from 3.0, or about one scale point below the halfway mark, to 4.4, or slightly above the halfway mark between "none" and "full" knowledge. Average post-session responses ranged from 4.4 to 5.9; most were between 5.0 and 6.0,

Table 3

Number and Percentage of Participants Who Reported Post-Session Mastery[a] of Staff Development Workshop Topics

	Workshop/Topic	Total Respondents	Number Reporting Mastery		(Percentage)
I	∘ Introduction and Overview	28	24		(85.7)
II	∘ Writing Behavioral Objectives	21	21		(100.0)
	∘ Application of Bloom's Taxonomy	21	21		(100.0)
	∘ L.E.P. Modifications	21	20		(95.2)
				Mean	(98.4)
IV	∘ Trends in E.S.L. Research	26	18		(69.2)
	∘ Classroom Application	26	21		(80.8)
	∘ Interactional Analysis	26	22		(84.6)
	∘ Instructional Groupings	26	20		(76.9)
				Mean	(77.9)
V	∘ Daily Living Skills Instruction	8	8		(100.0)
	∘ Methods for Teacher-Made Materials	8	8		(100.0)
	∘ Produce Teacher-Made Materals	8	8		(100.0)
				Mean	(100.0)

[a]Mastery was defined as a self-report at or above the mid-point between "none" and "full" knowledge.

- Mean percentage of participants who reported mastery of workshop topics ranged from about 77 percent for workshop IV to 100 percent for workshop V.

or about one point below "full" knowledge. These findings were comparable to the previous year's. (See Table 4.)

Participants' ratings of the presentation of the workshops indicated that they were generally well-received. Three workshops were rated on the following dimensions: organization; clarity of objectives; amount of benefit; and overall quality. Results, which are presented in Table 5, indicated that average ratings ranged from about 5.2 to about 6.2 on a seven-point scale.

CURRICULUM

The curriculum objective stated that by June, 1984 the program curriculum, would be field-tested, revised, and disseminated to the participating teachers. Field testing and revisions were completed during the previous cycle and by November, 1983 all participating teachers had received the curriculum guide. Accordingly, the objective was met.

Table 5

Mean Ratings[a] on Four Dimensions of Staff Development Workshop Presentation

Dimension	Types of Workshop: Introduction (N = 21)	E.S.L. Research (N = 26)	Daily Living Skills (N = 8)
Organization	5.6	5.1	6.0
Clarity of Objectives	5.8	5.1	6.5
Amount of Benefit	5.6	5.3	6.0
Overall Quality	5.5	5.2	6.1
Mean	5.6	5.2	6.2

[a]Ratings were made on a seven-point scale, ranging from 'poor' to 'excellent'.

[b]Number of respondents.

- There was some variability in respondents' reactions to the workshops. Averages ranged from about five to about six on a seven-point scale.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Analyses of data from pupil achievement records, interviews and observations with program staff and classroom teachers, program records of staff development and parent training, and participant responses to workshop evaluation questionnaires indicated that the ESL-SEDAC program was fully implemented during 1983-84, the second of three program years. The program, which supplemented the basic special education services of 260 handicapped L.E.P. students, provided direct pupil instruction, resource assistance, on-going individual staff training to 60 classroom teachers of participating students, and staff development and parent training workshops.

All program objectives were fully or partially attained. The proposed criteria for student achievement were met in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as was the criterion for improvement of the instructional skills of participating classroom teachers. Staff development and parent training workshops were effective and well-received, although not as well-attended as hoped. There were indications of improved parent involvement in program as well as non-program activities. Finally, the program completed field-testing, production, and distribution of a comprehensive curriculum, Day by Day in English: An ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide.

The conclusions based upon the findings of this evaluation lead to the following recommendations:

- continue to provide services to students, parents, and classroom teachers;
- explore additional ways of documenting pupils', achievement;
- seek to utilize program, school, and community resources to increase parental participation.